DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 135 734 95 SP 010 780

AUTHOR Goddu, Roland; Ducharme, Edward
TITLE Implications for Subsequent Conferences: Suggestions Drawn from Critique Information and Similar Experiences. No. 151.
INSTITUTION Nebraska Univ., Omaha.; New England Program in Teacher Education, Durham, N.H.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 1 Oct 76
CONTRACT 300-76-0228
NOTE 23p.; For related document, see SP 010 781
AVAILABLE FROM University of Nebraska at Omaha, Center for Urban Education, 3805 North 16th Street, Omaha, Nebraska 68110 ($2.00)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Conferences; *Meetings; National Programs; Organizations (Groups); *Participant Satisfaction; Program Content; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Program Improvement; *Program Planning; Symposia; Workshops
IDENTIFIERS *Teacher Corps

ABSTRACT

This paper was prepared to advise the Teacher Corps/Washington Management Team about the 1976 National Conference. The following questions were used to organize the body of the report: (1) Why a conference? (2) Why certain sessions? (3) Why certain participants? (4) Why certain presentors? and (5) What imperatives should direct planning and design? In answer to the first question, it is suggested that the Conference program be clear in focus, be accountable to a stated purpose, and be supportive of the needs of the persons involved in the Conference. In response to the second question, a conference activity sequence is proposed that allows presentors to have a more precise notion of expectations about what they are asked to do and why, and allows participants to know where they are in a discrete process and have a better idea of where and when to schedule social and recreational activity to enhance learning. Discussion of the third question reports that the relation of audience of the Conference to actual program offerings is not clear to the participants or the presentors and that the basis for inclusion or exclusion of content or persons is also unclear. Who is to be served and in what way is the question individuals, presentors, and projects need clearer signals about. The answer to the fourth question is that the choice of presentor should follow from what Teacher Corps determines participants should learn and what participants are told they will learn. In reply to question five, nine suggestions are presented for planning and design. (MM)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

$2.00

IMPLICATIONS FOR SUBSEQUENT CONFERENCES: SUGGESTIONS DRAWN FROM CRITIQUE INFORMATION AND SIMILAR EXPERIENCES

Prepared by:

Roland Goddu
Edward Ducharme

New England Program in Teacher Education
Pettee Brook Offices, Durham, N.H.

October 1, 1976

A PAPER FOR EXECUTIVE REVIEW

IMPLICATIONS FOR SUBSEQUENT CONFERENCES: SUGGESTIONS DRAWN FROM CRITIQUE INFORMATION AND SIMILAR EXPERIENCES

Roland Goddu
Edward Ducharme

October 1, 1976

Developed under contract with the University of Nebraska at Omaha as part of USOE contract No. 300-76-0228. However, the opinions expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U.S. Office of Education should be inferred.

New England Program in Teacher Education
Pettee Brook Offices
Durham, New Hampshire 03824

A. Introduction

This paper is prepared to advise the Teacher Corps/Washington Management Team about the Conference. While much of what is said here is drawn from the information collected at the 1976 Conference, some comments and suggestions have their roots in our experience outside that particular Conference: experience with Teacher Corps, with teacher education and particularly with national and regional conferences we have organized, implemented, or evaluated. Many observations are educated hunches. All are intended to suggest directions which could make the Teacher Corps Conference more responsive to the field, to the profession and to itself.

Yes, to the field, the profession and itself, for it has all those lives. It serves Teacher Corps personnel and projects and so reaches out to the field. It serves as the marketplace for ideas about teaching, education, and teacher education and so serves the profession. It also serves as a "heuristic, dynamic enterprise" which communicates the personality of Teacher Corps, and the vision of its leadership.

Our concern is that somehow the Conference should provide a limited amount of activity which can be described as Content in search of a Mission, and a significant amount of activity which can be entitled Mission in search of Structure. We tend to believe that the creative tension between what can happen in four days and what individuals and teams expect, can be resolved in the direction of targeted impact rather than expanded information or increased consciousness. Certainly, the evidence abounds that individuals, projects, Teacher Corps/Washington and all of us ask more of the Conference and its events than any Conference can be expected to provide or even plans to provide. Local project originated needs or national needs influence how much learning and expansion

of consciousness about Content, Mission or Structures are expected. We believe that the individual participant or the project as person being informed or learning carries the burden of responsibility for translating events into useful content and applications. The systematic organization of presentation mechanisms and teaching opportunities could more carefully delimit participant, project, Teacher Corps/Washington, Teacher Corps Director, planning group, and development group input, design, implementation, and evaluation. And the allocation in advance of those needs assessment, planning, implementation, follow up and evaluation roles and functions may well be what this Conference needs most.

The following questions have been used to organize the body of this report:

(1) Why a conference?

(2) Why certain sessions?

(3) Why certain participants?

(4) Why certain presentors?

(5) What imperatives should direct planning and design?

Many more observations could have been made under each heading. Only major items for consideration have been selected to focus decision making. A word of caution: reading of the Conference critique report itself should precede reading of this paper.

B. Why a Conference?

There are many conferences held yearly for many reasons. Some have existed for many years; some came into existence when Federal funds flowed into education. The Teacher Corps developmental conference is not old, its origin is directly tied to flow of federal funds. Yet, since the beginning, Teacher Corps has been committed by legislation to the support and development of local projects. The resultant tension between national agenda and local agenda can be seen as a creative opportunity or a situation ripe with conflict or both.

The 1976 Conference program did not seek to resolve the tension. More critically, the Conference did not explicate the conflict. Which agenda was being served when was not clear to the participants. Few knew if their participation should emphasize one or the other of the following as criteria

- *personal needs*
- *professional needs*
- *project development needs*
- *project management needs*
- *constituency response needs*
- *Teacher Corps guidelines needs*
- *Law and funding needs*
- *professional needs*
- *Teacher Corps survival needs*
- *teacher education improvement needs*
- *institutional reform needs*

The charge statement included in the evaluation folder, and the charges to participants received at the introductory session and the review sessions did not clearly distinguish what sessions were designed to serve which of these needs.

Project team reports distinguished among the sessions of the Conference. Projects noted that

(1) *project management needs were served by role group sessions and team meeting time.*

(2) *professional needs were served by skills sessions.*

(3) *project development needs were served by Strands.*

(4) *general Teacher Corps needs were served by General Sessions and sundry meetings called throughout the week.*

Many comments suggest that the format for project reports which required a focus on project objectives and proposed plan of action for the project did not fit the Conference style, the project style, or the Teacher Corps style. What these comments make clear is that the Conference presented many activities as task-oriented; they were task related for individuals not projects. Many more activities were Teacher Corps family ethos and style building oriented than were stated. The collegial emphasis of Teacher Corps operations requires time for consensus building decision making processes by teams. The putting together of individual task related learnings into project team plans for action was not allowed for at the Conference where many concurrent skill development sessions for individuals were scheduled from dawn 'til dusk.

This complaint surfaced often as the lack of time for project analysis and decision-making with the accompanying request for more project as project time. It may well be that the solution for a national conference planning group is to

(a) schedule more space between events

(b) clearly place responsibility for project time with the project.

This will require both acceptance of the reality of non-coverage by projects of some events, and creation of a mechanism that allows projects to provide evidence of use of project analysis and decision-making time to process learning and revise the project plan of action.

Thus, one has a concrete instance of tension between local agenda and national agenda for the Conference. If one expects action, and needs to be clear about expectations and directions, someone has to decide how participants and projects will spend their time.

The daily feedback on sessions and about team analysis repeatedly reveal that the public purposes imbedded in the Conference program shift day by day, but the criteria to examine the different activities are not stated anywhere. Only the most together and experienced projects have enough skill to articulate clear criteria on the participation in different kinds of activities to their publics: Teacher Corps, the team members, the project, the institutions they represent, themselves. The real reasons for having a Conference are both public and private, a condition that seems fair and acceptable to most. What needs clarification in statements (written and verbal) and in behavior of the visible leaders is what the Conference sponsors view as acceptable bases for judgment about quality of and participation in the Conference and its variety of activities.

In summary, (1) a national conference makes sense, (2) a clear mission statement for the Conference and a list of needs to be met by each type of session should be issued as clearly as possible in the spring and as soon as projects are funded; it should be used as a continuous reminder of focus even during the Conference itself, (3) each project should be allowed to limit its participation to precisely those activities serving individual, professional, and project related needs including project survival needs as determined by the project, (4) the Teacher Corps spirit and style should continue to be carefully nurtured and attended to both through formal (general session, special meeting) and informal events (real dialogue, exchange, and discussion time), and (5) the relation between field or national input should continue to be balanced by careful identification of the sources of input for the sessions and the single decision point for inclusion of

content and activity in the national conference - (that is, the Teacher Corps Director). Then, the Conference program will be clearer in focus, more accountable to a stated purpose, and more supportive of needs of persons involved in the Conference. Participants involved in a program with clear focal points will more clearly know what criteria to apply to the events they attend and to the learning they acquire as well as what they will be held accountable for by national and project level directors.

C. Why certain kinds of sessions?

Another tension a national conference planning group feels is what kinds of sessions to schedule. The tension resolution comes from addressing such questions as: Should learning experiences that serve strictly local needs be provided? Should special interest group agendas be served? Should all national priorities be presented? Should all conditions and constraints be described?

Sessions and Strands at this Conference covered many agendas:

- *the national priorities and mission*
- *the Teacher Corps style*
- *the Teacher Corps futures*
- *the Profession's attitudes*
- *the New Trends in Education*
- *the techniques that worked*
- *the conditions and constraints to be aware of*
- *some of the skills needed*
- *some of the special interest agendas*
- *some constituency responsive needs*
- *some role group analysis*
- *some recreation needs*
- *a little project team building*

Sessions serving the following agendas were noted as missing:

- *project team synthesis*
- *project team decision making*
- *project revision*
- *personal reflection and analysis*
- *reading materials*

These missing sessions may well be project and individual responsibility rather than Conference program responsibility. If that is so, projects and individuals should be made aware of the fact that the Conference planning group recognizes

these needs and expects them to decide how to use their time effectively to draw from the Conference program a balanced diet of sessions to serve individual, project, professional, and Teacher Corps agendas.

More interesting is the question why certain sessions or strands ended up the way they did. The critique information suggests a clear typology of planning process and session implementation strategies:

Type A. *specialist planned which transmitted information and reinforced attitudes, e.g., Exceptional Child Strand.*

Type B. *special interest group planned which sought visibility or recognition, e.g., Native American, Bilingual.*

Type C. *director planned which explored new dimension, e.g., Youth Advocacy.*

Type D. *outside professional planned which exposed a trend, direction, or innovation, e.g., Mann, Hersh sessions.*

At this Conference, the most impactful sessions on individuals were Type A and D; the most impactful on projects were Type C. The Conference planning and development group should consider how many of which type will be presented at a given year's conference. Since most participants and projects continue to report that the Conference is saturated and intense, it may be that what is needed is a public announcement that the Conference will exist every year and that certain topics will be addressed on a given cycle. With the possibility of five year project funding, specialized content each year seems a reasonable way to increase the possibility of in-depth learning by individuals and examination by projects of a topic. Such an approach would help decrease the discrepancy between how a given topic is handled in the planning stage, at the Conference, and in the projects. Impact on project utilization of concepts and structures to be learned would also be encouraged by more deliberate use of Type D and Type C sessions.

Such an approach might also more clearly distinguish the levels of involvement of different persons in planning, designing and implementing the Conference. As evaluators, we have very carefully limited involvement with the planning and implementation process. What we observed were the results, not the approach. The Conference planning groups should make public in writing in advance the planning format which probably included:

A. Planning

(1) Field (individuals and projects) state needs, concerns, confusion, interests.

(2) Staff (Teacher Corps Washington) states needs, problems, concerns, of projects based on monitoring.

(3) Planning group analyzes information from 1 and 2 and prepares suggested topics for 1977 Conference (probably ten topics).

(4) Teacher Corps Management Team selects topics to be covered.

B. Designing

(1) Planning group prepares preliminary agenda and field review procedure.

(2) Teacher Corps Management Team assigns topic to designated session development group (cf. Typology above).

(3) Session development group prepares session/strand program and material in cooperation with planning group.

(4) Teacher Corps Management Team approves session program plan.

(5) Session presentors design program based on approved session program plan.

C. Implementation

(1) Session presentors prepare necessary materials for pre-Conference announcement and Conference Handbook.

(2) Planning group operates Conference.

(3) Field and Teacher Corps (Washington) attend Conference, some field personnel assigned to manage sessions or strands.

(4) Presentors provide sessions as proposed.

(5) Field and Teacher Corps (Washington) evaluate Conference.

Making public the approach to be used in advance would assure that Conference content, priorities, presentors and participants would be determined in terms of needs by Teacher Corps Management Team with systematic involvement of constituencies, presentors, and participants.

Other specific considerations that the planning group might take into account are described in the following paragraphs.

There was little direct confrontation at the Conference. Negative reactions were highest around the NEA/AFT forum and the Bilingual General Session, yet not high enough to energize controversy. Some session comments suggest that the Conference schedule or format inhibits those who lack awareness of or interest in a developing or existing need from gaining exposure in that area. High positive strand session response on bilingual programs does not correspond to the somewhat negative comments made about the General Session which addressed Bilingual issues. The persons with negative reactions must have attended other strands or sessions, and the conflict remained unaddressed. The same may be true about persons confused about the application to Teacher Corps of multi-cultural education concepts and community education concepts.

The Conference might consider a format that requires more direct exposure by projects and individuals to ways of initiating change and negotiating program change in the proposed training programs. If the Conference planners wish to have highest impact on processes and applications of concepts in projects, then careful monitoring of what ideas and how they are implanted in projects and in sessions must be maintained. An inescapable conclusion of the data is that the highly effective sessions aroused participants to emotional involvement but little planned action. Responsibility for moving ideas to action must be energized by the presentors and the Conference itself. The Conference sessions cannot move projects

to action. The program can reiterate and make visible the expectations of individuals and projects to initiate action and change. The program can provide sessions to assist in program change as distinct from energizing to change.

The Conference planning group might examine how projects are visible at the Conference. Projects are presently visible in the sessions as exemplars of processes, products, and applications. Rarely and then only at the directors' breakfasts and through project team meetings did participants note the project as the organizing principle for activity at the Conference. The national conference makes visible national persons and rightly so; one might expect a Teacher Corps Conference with the implicit commitment to national and local collaboration to place more emphasis on the role of individual projects and project directors during the Conference for assuring that team planning, synthesizing, revising and even learning occurs as project directed rather than as individuals or role group directed. While it may be assumed that projects learn how to work together and to decide back home, the repeated impression one gains on project team reports is that two kinds of assistance can be provided at a national conference away from the constraints of the local environment.

(1) experience with and learning about styles of project decision-making

(2) experience with and learning about procedures for project program improvement, revision, and adaptation based on additional insightful and impactful learnings.

While the Conference planning group may choose to limit the focus of sessions and strands on information, attitudes, or processes that improve projects, the published agenda should make more visible what time, which workshops and what persons, projects can use for improving their decision making and their team building skills. Even some old and continuing projects were not clear about the expectations the Conference leadership had for project control of individual

participation in sessions. The need remains to articulate what the Conference leadership assumes the Project Director will take responsibility for. Requesting written feedback from a project does not mean project planning, revision, analysis, and action to some.

While social and recreational activity beyond the initial get-together is probably an individual and project level responsibility, many comments on Post questionnaires and some team reports addressed this issue. The number and type of comments might signal a change of constituency at the Conference. As more experienced teachers and school practitioners become the constituency of Teacher Corps, more informal across project and role group social events might be encouraged by leaving unscheduled time in the agenda in late afternoon.

Our major observation about the individual sessions concerns the scheduling of kinds of content. Inasmuch as the critique documents that attendance decreases as the week goes on and as the day goes on, and if what has impact is what is presented early on, it may be important to schedule key sessions where new content is presented early in the Conference. Sessions on process for implementing ideas and revising proposed project plan of action should come later. Thus, in this Conference, the "Teacher as Values and Moral Educator" Strand would have been held Monday, the role group sessions on Tuesday, and the skills session "Designing In-Service Programs" on Wednesday. This sequencing would certainly be more appropriate if project improvement becomes a clearer focus for the Conference.

The information in the critique suggests the following sequence would most enhance individual learning (even if it limits the diversity of opportunity):

Conference Activity Sequence

(A) WELCOMING ACTIVITY

(B) NATIONAL GROUP BUILDING ACTIVITY

(C) NATIONAL ATTITUDE SETTING ACTIVITY

(D) NATIONAL FOCUS SETTING ACTIVITY

(E) PRESENTATION OF PRIORITY CONTENT, TECHNIQUES, PROCEDURES, MECHANISM

(F) PRESENTATION OF PRIORITY CONDITIONS AND CONSTRAINTS

(G) PROJECT IMPROVEMENT ANALYSIS ACTIVITY

(H) PROJECT FOCUS SETTING ACTIVITY

(I) INDIVIDUAL EXPOSURE TO CONTENT, PROCEDURE, APPLICATION, AND REVIEW LEARNING ACTIVITIES

(J) PROJECT PLANNING ACTIVITY

(K) PROJECT PRIORITY SETTING ACTIVITY

(L) INDIVIDUAL ROLE CLARIFICATION ACTIVITY

(M) PROJECT ROLE CLARIFICATION ACTIVITY

(N) PROJECT PLAN FOR IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITY

(O) INDIVIDUAL REFLECTION TIME

(P) NATIONAL FUTURES AND NEW DIRECTIONS ACTIVITY

(Q) PROJECT CONSOLIDATION ACTIVITY

(R) NATIONAL CONFIRMATION OF DIRECTIONS ACTIVITY

(S) DEPARTURE ACTIVITY

In this design, project team activity would not be limited to the evaluation process, but each project would be asked to allocate time and activity in the Conference itself for other essential project improvement tasks. Also, the presentors would have a more precise notion of expectations about what they were asked to do and why; participants would know where they were in a discrete process and have a better idea of where and when to schedule social and recreational activity to enhance learning.

D. Why certain participants?

From the participant point of view, the Conference is more invitational than national. Not everyone involved in Teacher Corps gets to go. While the Conference planning group can do nothing to change this fact, it might consider lowering its expectations about what all participants can get out of the Conference. This is not to say that the Conference should not continue to provide vision, excitement, new ideas, exemplars of successful practices, directions, trends, and constraints. It does mean a more careful induction into the Conference process and a systematic monitoring of participant and project involvement should be emphasized. Again, the project is the point where the discrepancy must be negotiated. The Project Director selects the attendees; the Project Director knows what purposes are being served by these selections; the Project Director knows what impact the Conference may have on individuals as well as on the project. The Conference program cannot serve all these specific needs, but it can reiterate and reinforce the focus of the Conference agenda on impact to improve project objectives as the focus for participant interaction with the Conference events.

Another way of explicating this is to note that many comments on the project team reports and about individual sessions noted reactions from

(a) people totally new to Teacher Corps

(b) old timers who did like new directions of 11th Cycle

(c) old timers who did not like projected new directions

(d) 10th Cycle participants who wondered what was in all this for them

(e) people totally new to federally supported teacher education

(f) people who had special interests to defend, protect, expound.

Nowhere in the Conference was there recognition of the different categories of participants. Deans, State Department Representatives and Principals were treated as distant role groups but nowhere were participants treated as old, new or continuing participants even.

A resultant tension was the recurring plea for sharing information about

(a) what sessions would really cover

(b) what the rules really were

(c) what was expected of individuals

(d) what was the real future.

There was a resultant heavy pressure to get information from Teacher Corps/ Washington. The requests for information did not challenge the quality of information or conflict in policy - instead the requests were for precise, consistent information about three or four acceptable alternative solutions rather than for rationale, for some examples of acceptable and consistent procedure rather than for justification of the regulation. We note that the comments come not only from new participants, but old and continuing ones as well. Even if Teacher Corps insists that local projects have latitude for developing individual responses, many projects and individuals feel that there logically is some range or typology of acceptable answers; probably some number that is more than five but certainly less than 130 and certainly more than one.

In summary, the relation of audience of the Conference to actual program offerings is not clear to the participants or presentors. Basis for inclusion and exclusion of content or persons is unclear. Project development intent becomes subordinate to personal and sometimes to special interest group agendas. The loose monitoring of the project as organizing focus increases the possibility of transfer of political or personal agenda pressures to the national level and increases the difficulty of focusing the Conference program on project improvement tasks. Presentors read the participant expectations as attitude development and concept clarification for personal or professional needs rather than participant role in improving or changing project plans of action. Who is to be served in what way is the question individuals, presentors and projects need clearer signals about.

E. Why certain presentors?

Many participants report that presentors have a limited impression of the needs of the audience they are addressing. Some sessions by persons from Teacher Corps projects are included in this commentary. Some sessions are helpful and on target - Mann on Change, Hersh on Moral Education, Zigarmi on In-Service Designs, etc. Who presents at the Conference gives a message about what and who is considered important and significant. Many gave clear messages, but some sessions had agendas that did not relate clearly to Teacher Corps expectations or project needs. Many presentations tend to drift toward generalized observations about teacher education and generalized description of processes.

If both the conference and project needs are as focused as the Conference mission statement suggests, then the presentors need to be informed of these focuses, selected in terms of ability to deliver within these focal points, and monitored as to delivery of useful concept, process, and application which assists projects and individuals improve teacher education programs. Participant expectations are for concrete exemplars of process or content. The critique comments clearly suggest selecting presentations that provide prescriptions rather than descriptions, tools rather than opinions, procedures rather than history. Discussions of applicability and relevance to a real teacher education program's problems and needs are valued over discussions that emphasize logic or theoretical origins.

Presentors need to be informed of participant expectations. Tolerance for quality of presentation is affected significantly by time of session. Meal presentations are generally not favored, early in the day presentations are most favored. Presentors who use a clear beginning and an organized summation are favored. Handouts are constantly requested, but reading the handout by the presentor is not acceptable.

If Teacher Corps/Washington proposes to emphasize Project as demonstration, a very limited number of carefully selected presentors organized as were the Strands should be considered as an organizing principle for subsequent conferences. Interrelated sessions could trace the documented effort to move an idea or thrust of a given teacher education effort to an actual exemplar in practice. The awareness and excitement stages of idea selection could be presented first. Next, the idea clarification and development stage. Then, the processes for implementation and evaluation. Sessions would themselves demonstrate a systematic design sequence. Project teams could move from being informed about a concept or process, to examining alternatives for adapting the ideas to their project, and finally, to revising the existing plan of action of their project to utilize the learnings of the Conference. Such targeted information diffusion might lead to reduced participant overload and diffuse project reaction to conference session content.

In summary, what presentor is selected should follow from what Teacher Corps determines participants should learn and what participants are told they will learn. Leaving too much of this to presentors allows them to select focus, content, and perspective. Many participants find the presentors goring their pet bulls, not presenting information organized in a useful manner for project, role or individual growth and for implementing the Teacher Corps mission.

F. What imperatives should direct planning and design?

I. DECIDE WHAT YOU WANT THE CONFERENCE TO BE AND TELL PEOPLE EARLY.

Participants do not object to knowing the game they are playing and the rules of the game. Developing a mission statement and some specific focal points for the Conference before planning begins allows for influence by all, but more importantly for controlled influence. Projects repeatedly ask the context and limits of their decisions. The Conference should be one instance where appropriate decision making patterns are modeled.

II. DECIDE WHO YOU WANT TO INVITE TO PARTICIPATE AND WHY.

Identifying who attends needs to be refined to identify newcomers, continuers, reappearers, at least, and to specify not only role groups attending but also the expected effect of different participant's learnings to improving a project. At least one should survey to determine if projects have identified persons whom they expect to learn how to have impact on the governance, instructional, managerial, curricular, or evaluation objectives of a project.

III. DECIDE WHAT YOU WANT SESSIONS TO DELIVER AND TELL PRESENTORS AND PARTICIPANTS WHAT IS EXPECTED.

Criteria for judging an event comes not only from general professional context and from sponsor (Teacher Corps) expectations but also from a clear statement of the limited learning expectations for the different sessions and kinds of sessions. While much of the critique information suggest clear limitation of number and type of sessions, some of the reported learning overload comes from having to decide what a presentation has provided that is usable for the different agendas the participants and projects perceive. Limiting expectations limits the amount of energy needed for sorting out the purpose for having learned something and increases the time available for synthesis and adaptation. Even when one seeks to enrich diversity, a design is more significant than a collage. Strands are a design that did this best.

IV. DECIDE WHAT PROJECTS WILL BE EXPECTED TO PRODUCE AT CONFERENCE AND FORMALLY ACKNOWLEDGE THAT THEY WILL USE SOME OF THE TIME TO REACH THESE PRODUCTS BEFORE THEY LEAVE

If project improvement or even learning or sharing is a Conference expectation, projects must be allowed to schedule time to prepare, analyze, review, and produce the plans for action or documents one hopes for. Back home, projects will do the project; at the Conference they will do the exploration, modification, and consolidation of learning into a revised plan for action if one expects this of them and encourages their use of time during the Conference to do this.

V. PUT NEW, KEY, TO BE TAKEN NOTICE OF CONTENT UP FRONT IN THE CONFERENCE SEQUENCE

Placement on the schedule determines importance. Using meal time for something important increases the risks that it will be neglected. Putting something on Thursday signals something one should be aware of but not something considered essential.

VI. GIVE THOSE WHO ASSIST IN SESSION DESIGN AN ACTIVE ROLE AT THE CONFERENCE AS SESSION OR STRAND MANAGERS AND RESPONSIBLE AGENTS

Commitment to taking something seriously comes in part from being responsible for it at the Conference. That project directors saw each other completing the evaluation encouraged high response to the evaluation. Of note, though, is that project directors were not the evaluators; participants can be leaders, planners, designers, managers and participants, but unless some urgent need is addressed, a very few project personnel should be in trainer/instructor/presentor roles.

VII. SELECT PRESENTATION SPACE THAT ASSURES A LEARNING CLIMATE THAT SUPPORTS SESSION OBJECTIVES.

Quality of learning in a large Conference is significantly influenced by ambience and climate. Interruptions in process, no matter what the motivation (e.g., documentation), should be unobtrusive and limited. When a session is started and going, its learning agenda should be given highest priority.

VIII. CONTINUE TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF PLANNING, DESIGNING, EVALUATION AND DOCUMENTATION PROCEDURES

The planning, the designing, the evaluation and the documentation all worked. Clarification of procedures, materials, and allowable impact on sessions and participants in each area should be shared with the persons selected for these tasks as early as possible.

IX. CONTINUE TO INCREASE THE QUALITY OF CONFERENCE RELATED EFFORTS (FOOD SERVICES, SOCIAL AND RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES, REGISTRATION)

The micromania of a Conference is best when unnoticed. It also requires the greatest effort on the part of Conference planners. That commentary was made of these items indicates the importance in a planning effort.

Conclusion

What a Conference is depends in large part on its history. What a Conference becomes depends on the vision of those who energize it. A critique can only suggest directions and context; the life that emerges comes from the often tenuous, certainly persistent, insight of a very few people that make things happen during the time when the Conference is being put together and put to bed. Certainly those few persons, Paul Collins, Beryl Nelson, Floyd Waterman, do an incredible job with a complex assignment. We hope these comments make their task and the Teacher Corps Management Teams decisions easier.